UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,062	10/10/2003	Toshimitsu Watanabe	16869S-096800US	3243

20350 7590 03/17/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
LESPERANCE, JEAN E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/684,062	**Applicant(s)** WATANABE ET AL.	
	Examiner JEAN E. LESPERANCE	**Art Unit** 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 December 2007_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _9 and 10_ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _9 and 10_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 November 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _11/10/03, 5/24/04, 12/26/06, 2/21/07, 4/2/07_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response to restriction requirement filed December 20, 2007 is entered and claims 9 and 10 are pending.

2. The Information Disclosure Statements filed October 10, 2003, May 24, 2004, December 26, 2006, February 21, 2007, and April 2, 2007 are considered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's election without traverse of 9-10 in the reply filed on December 20, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,659,328 ("Todokoro et al.") in view of USPN 5,841,411 ("Francis").

Regarding claim 9, Todokoro et al. teach the voltage source 56 outputs a DC voltage of, e.g., 5 [kV] to permit the phosphor to luminesce with a sufficient luminance (see Figure 4); a display panel Fig.4 (41); the driving data is directly applied to the S/P converter 6. On the basis of the check driving data converted into parallel data by the S/P converter 6, the modulated signal generator 5 output a modulated signal (see Figure 4); and the device current measurement circuit Fig.4 (3) wherein the memory control CPU 9 reads out the device current (initial value) from the memory 11 (column

10, lines 9 and 10) corresponding to the first current value and calculates the correction value for driving conditions on the basis of the readout value (column 10, lines 11 and 12) corresponding to a second current value. Accordingly, the prior art teaches all the claimed limitations with the exception of providing a video signal processing circuit. However, Francis teaches a video signal processing circuit Fig.1 (24). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the video signal processing circuit as taught by Francis in the system disclosed by Todokoro because this would provide the measurement and storage of variations in the initial characteristics of individual surface conduction electron emitting devices beforehand, and correct the driving conditions for each surface conduction electron emitting device on the basis of the stored contents (column 4, lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 10, Todokoro et al. teach the voltage source 56 outputs a DC voltage of, e.g., 5 [kV] to permit the phosphor to luminesce with a sufficient luminance (see Figure 4); a display panel Fig.4 (41); the driving data is directly applied to the S/P converter 6. On the basis of the check driving data converted into parallel data by the S/P converter 6, the modulated signal generator 5 output a modulated signal (see Figure 4); a scan signal generator Fig.4 (42); and the device current measurement circuit Fig.4 (3) wherein the memory control CPU 9 reads out the device current (initial value) from the memory 11 (column 10, lines 9 and 10) corresponding to the first current value and calculates the correction value for driving conditions on the basis of the readout value (column 10, lines 11 and 12) corresponding to a second current value. Accordingly, the prior art teaches all the claimed limitations with the exception of providing a video signal processing circuit. However, Francis teaches a video signal processing circuit Fig.1 (24). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the video signal processing circuit as taught by Francis in the system disclosed by Todokoro because this would provide the measurement and storage of variations in the initial characteristics of individual surface conduction electron emitting devices beforehand, and correct the driving conditions for each surface conduction electron emitting device on the basis of the stored contents (column 4, lines 25-30).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the ably examiner should be directed to Jean Lesperance whose telephone number is (571) 272-7692. The examiner can normally be reached on from Monday to Friday between 10:OOAM and 6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shalwala Bipin, can be reached on (571) 272-7681.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Jean Lesperance

Art Unit 2629

Date 3/10/2008

/Bipin Shalwala/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629